

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 5, 13 and 14 are amended along the lines suggested by the Examiner on page 3 of the Official Action. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is therefore respectfully requested.

From a prior art standpoint, independent Claim 1, is again rejected based on the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 6,390,381, hereinafter Laing.

Laing discloses a process for adjusting the heating loops in heating systems in which the temperature difference for each loop is compared to determine the loop with the largest temperature difference, and that loop's throttle valve is kept fully open. The Official Action evidently takes the position that Laing's loop with the largest temperature difference corresponds to a heat exchanger having a largest specific size of a heat demand.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited specific size represents a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period. Even assuming some basis exists for the assertion that a temperature difference can correspond to a heat demand, Applicants respectfully submit that it is quite clear that a temperature difference does not represent a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period. Indeed, Laing makes no mention of a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying

medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period. Instead, Laing is focused on the relative temperature differences of the various loops.

Accordingly, even assuming some basis exists for the Examiner's interpretations as set forth in the most recent Official Action, it is quite clear that a method for adjusting several parallel connected heat exchangers, which are supplied with a heat carrying medium, comprising the steps of detecting for each heat exchanger a specific size of the heat demand of the heat exchanger in a predetermined period, the specific size representing a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period, comparing the specific sizes of all heat exchangers with each other, and changing the setting of the heat exchanger with the specific size displaying the smallest heat demand in a manner which increases the heat demand, as recited in Claim 1, is patentably distinguishable from the disclosure in Laing. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

New Claim 21 corresponds to previously presented Claim 1 rewritten to include the subject matter of currently amended Claim 5. On page 9 of the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness rejection and in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 21 clearly corresponds to such a claim, and is therefore allowable.

New Claim 22 is similar to Claim 1, except that, in Claim 22, the specific size of the heat demand represents a deviation between a desired temperature in a room and an actual temperature in the room. This subject matter is supported, for example, by the disclosure in lines 14-28 of page 5 of the application, which

discusses an embodiment in which the specific size of the heat demand represents a deviation of a desired value, and in lines 5-17 of page 14, in which it is clear that the desired value can be a desired room temperature, which is input at a desired value inlet 31, and its deviation is the difference between the desired value and the actual room temperature, which is determined by the temperature sensor 32. By contrast, as discussed above, what the Examiner refers to as a deviation of a desired value in Laing is simply the temperature difference between the feed-line temperature and the return-line temperature within a particular heating loop. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the apparatus recited in new Claim 22 is also patentably distinguishable from the disclosure in Laing.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 11, 2011

By: /Peter T. deVore/  
Matthew L. Schneider  
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60361

**Customer No. 21839**  
703 836 6620